

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 39.—No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 16, 1821. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

TO
LAWYER SCARLETT,
On his Poor-Law Bill.

Kensington, 12 June, 1821.

LAWYER SCARLETT,

An old Quaker, at Philadelphia, when I was there writing away at a most famous rate, about 25 years ago, used to send me a letter about once a week, containing these words, and no more: "Friend William, keep thyself *cool*." It appears to me, that you stand, at this particular time, in great need of some such friend. When a blade, however aspiring, is fairly *tackled*, and is manifestly to all the world destined to be *twisted down*, his wise course is to undergo the operation with *good humour*. A stiff-necked onion that does not, as the gardeners call it, *come kindly to hand*, is sure to suffer more than others, and stands a chance of being, in the end, completely snapped off. It is generally found that the plants, which make this unavailing resistance,

have little or no *bottom*; that all they have is *show*, mere *rack* and leaf and sap.

It is the object of this letter to show you, that the project which you have in hand was calculated to end in the manner in which it obviously will end, and that if your anger be kindled against any one on account of the failure, it ought to be solely against yourself, seeing that nobody pressed you to undertake the adventure, and seeing that you rushed into it wholly unprepared.

I shall first notice what has recently passed "*within doors*" relating to your case, beginning with certain censures bestowed by your brother lawyer, Mr. Brougham, on the opposition which your bill had met with "*out of doors*," which that hero of St. Omer's called "*equally unprincipled and short sighted*." This gentleman has, very prudently, been remarkably *quiet* of late; and, perhaps, that was a course to have been still pursued; especially as the "*Educational Digest*," after having just poked out its horns, has, snail-like, drawn them in, and

2 H

Printed by C. CLEMENT, and published by JOHN M. COBBETT, 1, Clement's Inn.
[Price Sixpence Halfpenny in the Country.]

kept them completely covered by the shell. The nation was to be *saved*, all of a sudden, by being *taught*; saved by Scotch schoolmasters; taught *industry* by those who were living upon the fruit of its labour, and filled with morality by those whose whole skill consists in adroitly helping on the works of corruption, and who are like fish out of water in an *v* system, which does not give full employment to bands of spies and informers. This grand scheme disappeared, all at once, nobody seems to know how, or from what cause. Now, the scheme was either wise or foolish, and it was the offspring of sheer presumption or ignorance not less pure and unmixed. If the former, why was it dropped? If the latter, why has it not taught the schemer modesty in speaking of the opposition to other new-fangled schemes?

This gentleman is a large talker about the "*liberty of the press*;" but, what is this liberty, then, if argument, which he does not attempt to *answer*, is to be deemed "*unprincipled*?" The opposition had been of some weight, or it had not. If of *no weight*, why did he notice it? If of *weight*, did he imagine to destroy its effect by merely calling

it hard names? How was the scheme to *suffer* from an opposition which he deemed unworthy of an attempt to answer? And, if the opposition had done *no harm* to the scheme, why was it made an object of *abuse* with a defender of the scheme? It is easy to discover here the spirit of intolerance and of persecution. The fault usually found of writers, when prosecuted, is, that they do *not discuss*; that they deal in censure and imputations without even the forms of *discussion*. This could not be said in the present case. These were facts; these were arguments; the former remain *undenied* and the latter without even an attempt at *refutation*; and yet this lawyer calls the whole *unprincipled* as well as *short-sighted*! Aye, and if he had the power, would *punish* it too, though the act would, doubtless, fill your gentle breast with abhorrence!

As to the *short-sightedness* of the opposition "*out of doors*," to be sure it had no pretensions to *second sight*; but, it appears to have been pretty *efficient*; and, some men would have thought it their duty to *prove* that it was short-sighted before they *called* it so. Those who have defended the Labouring Classes,

have, at any rate worked without *fee*, and without a possibility of reward. Nay, with the certainty of displeasing every man in the country who is a bad man and rich man. They have had to brave the greatest mass of power, joined to the greatest mass of wickedness. How, therefore, their conduct could with justice be called *unprincipled* it is for Mr. Brougham to explain. The cause of the Labouring Classes may be *betrayed* from a want of principle. It is easy to conceive, that a greedy, profligate adventurer, destitute of all feeling, resolved, by hook or by crook, to gorge himself with public spoil, will be ready enough to volunteer in an attack upon the defenceless Labouring Classes, in order to show that he is a man fitted to purposes of cruelty, and thereby to ingratiate himself with powerful oppressors. This is a character that we may conceive easily enough; and, it may truly enough be said, that, in such case, the conduct is *unprincipled*. But, in the other case, though there may be folly, though there may be excessive weakness, there can be no want of principle: the conduct of the advocate for the Labourer may be childish in the extreme; it may be short-sighted even approach-

ing to blindness; but, it cannot be called *unprincipled*.

After all, however, we do not, perhaps, understand each other as to the meaning of these epithets. To be the Queen's settled advocate, and while in this situation to go to the Ministers, in 1819, and make, without her authority, a proposition including a condition that she shall abandon the very name of *Queen*; to go afterwards, in company with the agent of the Ministers, to meet the Queen, and to give her no advice, when a threat is tendered her at Saint Omer's; after this to advise her to refuse a settlement, because her name was not put in the Liturgy, though, long before, this advocate had proposed that she should abandon her very *title as Queen*; this, perhaps, is to act a *principled* part: this is not to be *unprincipled*, perhaps: and, if that be the case, I am ready to allow, that the defence of the Labouring Classes against the imputations contained in your bill has been totally destitute of principle.

We will now quit Mr. Brougham for the present, and come to the transactions "*in doors*" with regard to this measure, which, I repeat, strikes at the very root of civil Society in England.

SIR ROBERT WILSON called it the Poor-spoliation bill; and this you called "*factionous* opposition." Indeed! what, *so high* already! Gad, there is need of the gardener's hand pretty quickly! "*Factionous* opposition" means an opposition which has no view but that of answering some selfish purpose of the opponent; and what view of this sort could SIR ROBERT WILSON have? His appellation was *just*; for what does *spoliation* mean but to *despoil*, to *strip*, to *leave destitute*. You objected to a "*nick-name*" being given to your bill. This was very natural; but, give me leave to say, that it was not prudent for you to let your objection *out*! Nick-names are the fashion in bill-making. "*Bank-restriction* bill" was as pretty a nick-name as ever was given to any thing in this world; and, yet, did it much surpass that of the "*Poor-Law improvement* bill?" Sir Robert's appellation had *sense* in it; it, in some degree, justly described the thing; and, if it were a nick-name, it only supplied the place of another nick-name. To refuse a man relief, who cannot get work, to *compel* him to *starve*, or *beg*, or *steal*, and to leave him exposed to *whipping* and *imprisonment* for

begging, and to *transportation* or *hanging* for *stealing*; if this be not worthy of the name of *spoliation*, I wonder what is; and, if you chose to call it a "*Poor-law improvement* bill," are others to adopt the same name? By *false names* infinite mischief is done: if "*Bank-stoppage*," instead of "*Bank-restriction*," had been made use of, the ruinous bubble would have burst long ago, and the nation would have known nothing of its present calamities.

What passed relative to the Bill on the 6th of June was very curious. SIR ROBERT WILSON began by recommending to the attention of Members SWIFT's "*Modest Proposal*;" that is to say, a proposal "to relieve the *distresses of Ireland*," and the main thing which he had in view was to induce the landlords to *EAT the children of the labourers*, contending, that they must have a *right* to do it, seeing that they were in the daily practice of *devouring the parents*.

This was *such* a cut at your bill, that your "*Learned*" Friend, Brougham, seems to have thought himself called upon to interfere. "He had hoped that Members would have abstained from the introduction of topics which could do no

"possible good to the Poor
 " (hear!). The objections to the
 " Bill contained in the Petition
 " proceeded upon a mistake very
 " fatal to a disputant, the total
 " misapprehension of the argu-
 " ment to which they were op-
 " posed. No one had ever said
 " that the Poor Laws *operated as*
 " *an incentive to marriages*, but
 " that they *removed the check to*
 " *improvident marriages* which
 " would be otherwise supplied by
 " the fear of absolute want
 " (hear!). He thought it *unwise*
 " *too for the sake of the Poor*
 " *themselves*, to be continually
 " holding out to them the doctrine
 " that they were *mortgages upon*
 " *the land, nay preferable mort-*
 " *gages*; for though as the law
 " stood this was perhaps true,
 " it necessarily had an operation
 " *injurious to the Poor themselves*.
 " The operation of such a sys-
 " tem it needed no speculatist, as
 " *Mr. Malthus* was represented
 " to be, though on these subjects
 " no one was more plain and prac-
 " tical (hear!) to shew. The
 " doctrine of *Mr. Malthus* was,
 " that nothing was more preju-
 " dicial to the community and to
 " the individuals themselves, that
 " persons without knowing how
 " to maintain a family should put
 " themselves in a situation in

" which they were sure to pro-
 " duce a family (hear!). There
 " was surely nothing abstruse or
 " speculative in this; when out
 " of such a fund as the Poor's
 " Rates they were sure of being
 " supplied with support without
 " reference to the state of the
 " country, to the times, and
 " almost he might say, according
 " to the present administration of
 " the Poor Laws, *without any*
 " *reference to the disposition of the*
 " *individual to work* (hear, hear!)
 " The proper restraint on mar-
 " riage was taken away at the
 " moment when it should operate.
 " The poor were prevented from
 " thinking twice when they had
 " to decide on the question whe-
 " ther they should marry or not.
 " It should be *impressed upon*
 " *them*, that to put themselves in
 " the situation to get a family
 " without the means of maintain-
 " ing it, *was as bad as to go into*
 " *a shop and buy goods without*
 " *having means of paying for*
 " *them* (hear, hear!). *Mr. Mal-*
 " *thus* had very properly said,
 " that it should be impressed on
 " the people, that *to rush into*
 " *marriage under such circum-*
 " *stances was neither honest nor*
 " *politic.*"

Thus some *doctrines* got out.
 Why should want, the fear of

absolute want, ever exist in the mind of a *hale labourer*? Miserable are the times, and bad is the government when such a fear overpowers the inclination to marry. What can any community want with such a *check*, if it be in the state, in which it ought to be? The labouring man does not seek a *fortune*. He *ought not* to do it; or, all would aim at being *masters*. His labour is the source of his *income*; and, as he carries that about in his person, why should he not marry, when he feels disposed to marry? Why should he have any *fears* to prevent him from marrying? Mr. BROUGHAM calls it "*rushing into marriage*," and says, that it is "*neither honest nor politic*" for "*the labourer to do this*," unless "*he has the means of supporting a family*." Why, he *has* the means. He always has the means. He has his *labour*; and, if he be fairly and honestly paid for that, he knows he shall always have wherewith to support a family. And, if he be, by no matter what means, robbed of a great part of that, let those who rob him keep his family. Take "*away the false money*," he has a right to say: "let me have my "*two bushels of best wheat*, "*nine gallon measure a week*,

"and my four bushels in the "*harvest month*, and my bottle "*of beer every day*; and I will "*keep a family*, I warrant you, "*without any thing out of your "*poor-rates*; let me be as my "*grandfather was*, and your poor- "*rates will be what they were in "*in his day*, without any of "*your schemes to check my "*breeding*."***

This project of yours has done a great deal of good, though in a way that you appear little to have thought of. CASTLEREAGH hailed it, *thanked* you for it, and said, that the *discussion* would *do good*. He was very right; for it has led to a discussion which has produced a *general and complete conviction* of the REAL CAUSE of the augmentation of the poor-rates; and this conviction it is that will be fatal to your project. The Letter to "Mr. "*HAYES on Lawyer Scarlett's Bill*" must be *answered*. Its facts must be denied; its arguments completely refuted; before your Bill can pass, or be patiently listened to. In that letter the *rights* of the poor are *established*. And, why does Mr. Brougham object to the doctrine, that the poor are *mortgagees* upon the land? The Fundholders have no sort of objection to call them-

selves mortgagees upon the land, and they draw more than *seven times* as much from it and from labour as the poor draw from the rates, which, as I have clearly *proved*, are paid by the labourers themselves. The Fundholders say they have a mortgage on all the land; and, if they were to stop at that they would fall short one half, I believe. The *whole of the rental* is not more than *one half* enough for them. The rest comes out of taxes on labour. What! have they a mortgage on labour too? Is the labour of the child in the cradle mortgaged to them? This is, indeed, a system of bondage; bondage without the *flesh-pots*! But the muck-worm may say all this; and if any one say, that the poor have *any rights*, he is a "blasphemer," I suppose. "For the good of the poor themselves" this ought not to be said! The poor will, doubtless, thank you, Mr. BROUGHAM, as the people did WILLIAM LAMB, who voted for the absolute power of imprisonment bill "for the good of the people themselves!" Yea, purely out of love for the people, that kind gentleman voted for a bill to enable the Ministers to shut them up in prisons at their pleasure!

We know, therefore, how to

interpret phrases like this. We do not believe, and we shall not believe, that the "good of the poor themselves" require, that they should look upon themselves as having *no rights*, no claim upon the land, no demand upon their country, in the hour of their distress. Mr. LOCKART, in the debate of the 24th of May, said that this was a most "important question, not only as it affected *property*, but as it was connected with the preservation of that *stimulus*, which proceeded from that *law of nature*, which teaches man to depend on his *own prudence*, *economy* and *exertions*, in endeavouring to make himself *useful to his country*." Useful to his country! A law of nature teaching a man to make *exertions* to render him *useful to his country*! This is Oxford or Westminster-Hall law of nature, I suppose? It is such law of nature as never was, I will engage, heard of any where else.

The laws of nature teach a man to depend on his *own exertions*, indeed; but without any reference to *country* or *community*. They teach him to make exertions *for his own benefit*, and for that *alone*. And, mind, Lawyer, the exertions dictated by

the law of nature have a very ample field indeed: they are bounded only by the extent of man's craft and force. Leave the matter to the law of nature, and it will be soon settled? for that law knows nothing of armies, judges, justices, jailors and hangmen: it tells the man to go and take food and raiment wherever he can get at them. It knows nothing of militia duties and local militia duties. It knows of no force to compel the poor to turn out in arms to defend the lands and houses of the rich. Therefore, if you love my peace of mind, Mr. LOCKART, say not, in this case, another word about the *law of nature*. Stick to the *law-books*: stick to the statutes: stick to pains and penalties: stick to enactments, and say not another word about that wild legislatoress, *nature*; for she would *souse* you all in a moment. If you tell the labourer, who is out of employment, to go to the law of nature for relief, he, of course, if *stronger* than you, enters your pantry, cellar, wardrobe, and bed-room, without more ado. "Oh! you vile wretch, do you advise the poor to rob!" *Kob!* No; for there is no such word in nature's "*education digest*." And,

besides, I am not advising the poor to rob: I am cautioning you against pushing them on to robbery; for, be relieved, rob or starve, they must, and nature commands them *not to starve*, let them get the food where and how they may.

Mr. FRANKLAND LEWIS, in this debate of the 24th of May, "denied that the house ought to consider that *or any other law* on the subject as one which they were not *perfectly justified* in amending, according to the demand of the time, or their altered view of the circumstances of the case.—The basis of the Constitution was, the security which it gave to all persons in the enjoyment of *whatever property they had acquired, or honestly come by*. It was utterly vain to set up any other principle *as one of right*. If it could be shown that the principle of the Poor Laws was subversive of that by *which property was protected*, then it would be evident that such an antagonist principle ought not to be allowed to prevail."

This, in part is right enough; but he will stop, I hope, till it be shown, that the poor-laws are subversive of the principle, on which other property stands. As to

property being the *basis of the Constitution*, that is very deep matter; but, I can understand well enough, that the legislature is to *alter laws*, according to time, and circumstances: for instances the law which empowers rotten boroughs to send members to Parliament, and the laws which give the fundholders three times the amount of all the rents, and enable them to sell and transfer the labour to be performed by the child now in the cradle; and, in fact, enable them to make bondmen and bondwomen of all those who belong to the labouring classes in England; for, what is a bondman, if he be not one who labours *upon the bare means of existence for the benefit of another?* These laws may assuredly be altered, if the poor-laws can; and with a great deal more justice, as it has been clearly proved in my Preliminary Part to Paper against Gold.

The "Constitution" is a deep matter; and, for any thing that I know to the contrary, this Mr. Frankland Lewis may be right in saying, that *its basis* is the security which it gives "to all persons in the enjoyment of property." But, I know, that this is, by no means, the basis of *civil society*. Its basis is the security

and good of *the whole of a people*; and, if it have any other basis, it is a tyranny. It is a thing arising out of fraud, or force, or both combined; and not arising out of common consent. Now, it never can have happened, that the millions *consented* to the establishment of a state of things, in which they should live half-starved for the benefit of the thousands; and, therefore, when such a state of things arises, *an alteration should take place*. It cannot have arisen out of any fault in the millions. They *must* have desired their *own good*. There must be *error*, at least, somewhere, and it ought, with all possible speed, to be rectified; but, it is not to be rectified by additional severity on the sufferers.

LORD CASTLEREAGH observed, in this debate of the 24th of May, that "the difficulties could not be got rid of but by *frequent discussion*, by accustoming the poor to consider *how much they were degraded from the character of Englishmen by the PRESENT SYSTEM.*" Good! This is precisely what I have been labouring at for *nineteen years!* Precisely the object of dear little *Two-penny Trash*, which is as much my favourite child as this bill seems to be yours. Precisely the

object and end of all my labours. How have I toiled, head and fingers; how many thousands of reams of paper and how many scores of barrels of ink have I caused to be employed for the purpose of convincing the people of England, that they are miserable slaves compared to what their forefathers were, that they are, in my lord's own judicious words, "*degraded from the character of Englishmen by the PRESENT SYSTEM!*" And, ye gods, how have ye "*thundred*" upon me for these my endeavours! What a running of the gauntlet ye have given me! And, how often have ye said, that I took "*advantage* of the "*distresses of the people, and deluded them,*" when I told them this very thing!

Faith, there was little need of the *present* discussion to make the Labouring Classes see their degradation. The discussion, however, has done a great deal. The *real cause* never was before so clearly placed before the eyes of the nation. The *time* is favourable: *events* work for truth, and, of course, for me. I saw that they would, or *I never should have seen England again.* I never would have come to partake in *permanent degradation.*

The *time* is singularly auspicious. Distress has seized hold of those, who had no feeling in their prosperous days. All are ready to *listen.* The stupid, corrupt trading press can no longer blind men's eyes; the tide of conviction rolls on; and the long-eared, tooting press goes along with it. The Scotch Economists are dumb-founded. All their speculations have become mere dreams. Their doctrine of "*infinite augmentation of capital*" has been blown to air. Plain sense is coming back, and nonsense and fraud and rascality recede at her approach.

The Labouring Classes have to congratulate themselves on the bringing in of your bill. Their case has, in consequence of that bill, been fully stated. We now, for the first time, hear plenty of people to support my old doctrine of *deduction from wages*; and I must confess, that the people "*in doors*" have, upon this occasion, acted well and manfully. Sir ROBERT WILSON, Mr. CALCRAFT, Lord MILTON, Mr. COURTENAY, Mr. MONCK, Mr. GURNEY (of Norwich) and several others, have stood forward, as became English Gentlemen, to reprobate a measure so full of injustice, cruelty, and even folly. Amongst the rest, not a

word. do we hear from "*Eng-land's Glory!*" Oh, no! This is too *trifling* a matter to be grasped by his giant mind, which can no more feel it than the hand of the ploughman can a single clover-seed. It is not *big* enough for him. He must have some *grand affair*, worthy of his mighty genius; something incomprehensible and without end; and that has nothing to do with the back or the belly. Now, in this I totally differ from "*England's Glory.*" I give not a thought to any thing that has not a *practical end* in view. However, there are, in this case, quite men enough to prevent this odious bill from becoming a *law*.

There appears to me a monstrous inconsistency in the grounds, stated by you, at different times, of this strange proceeding. At the second reading of the bill you said, that it was clear, "that it was *not the increase of population* but the *diminution of wages* that produced the evil." You did not say this during the *first debate!* You said not a word about this, till after the twist in my Letter to Mr. HAYES. However, you did say it on the second reading of the bill. And, now, pray, Lawyer SCARLETT, having dis-

covered, by the aid of my eyesalve, that a *diminution of wages* was the cause of the evil, did you not also discover that a remedy was not to be found in *discouraging marriage?* Having, I say, discovered, that an *increase of population* was *not* the cause of the evil, how came you to persevere in the project for *checking population* in the way of *remedy* for that evil?

I find, in another part of the same speech, something like an attempt to reconcile this, and a very miserable attempt it is, as we shall now see. "The farmer finding that he was *called on to pay heavy poor-rates*, resorted to the practice of *diminishing the wages of labour.*" What! Can you put the cart before the horse in one place, and behind the horse in another? The *evil*, of which you say so much, is the *increase of the poor-rates*. You tell us, in one place, that this is *caused by the diminution of the wages of labour*: and, in another place, that it is *the cause of that very diminution*. I have heard you talk of the *inconsistency of others*. I have heard you join in that cuckoo cry. But, can you produce, in the history of the whole life of any other person, inconsistency so flagrant

as this. In short, when you came to the second reading, you were what the Irish call *bothered*. The subject had been *tackled*; and you, in your own proper person, appear to have felt all the contending difficulties, with which the whole system is labouring.

But, come; the cause of the *evil* is, you now say, a *diminution of the wages of labour*, and not an *increase of population*. It is useless to ask you why you do not abandon the check-population clause, seeing that you have arrived at this conviction? It is useless to ask you that, because no reason *can* be given. But, if you found, from me, or from any body else, that there had been an injurious *diminution of wages*, was not the *cause* of this diminution a thing to be *inquired into before you went any further*? For, what are we to say of the man, who could be convinced, that a diminution of wages was the cause; who could be convinced that the Labourers had been pinched and degraded *from this cause*; who could be convinced that they had been despoiled in this way; who could see them *getting back* a small part in poor-rates, and who could coolly propose *to take even that part from them*? Having dis-

covered, that the Labourers had been despoiled, was not the first thing to be sought for, *the cause of that spoliation*? And did you not find that cause clearly and fully stated in the Letter to Mr. HAYES? Was ever effect traced to cause more clearly? Did ever brick, falling from a house and killing a man, more clearly produce death, than the paper money produced the robbery of the Labouring Classes?

Here was the cause of all the mischief. The accursed paper went on augmenting in quantity and diminishing in value. The Labourer, who was paid in *shillings and pence*, got indeed an augmentation in nominal amount, but he got less and less food and raiment for his week's labour. The farmer soon perceived, that the "*out-doors*" men were *cheapest*; for he could not *bilk the bellies* of those "*in-doors*." His next step was to get these out of doors. Finding that the poor wretches must die, or be *too weak to toil*, without an occasional augmentation of wages, he fell upon the scheme of giving the married ones something more than the single ones; and this *under colour of poor rates*! Here, then, is the *cause*, and the only cause, of the rise in the amount of the poor-

rates. And this cause you, and, indeed, all of you, *blink*: you say not a word about it. Others talk of the diminution of wages, and now you talk of it, but they only lay the cause to the *taxes*, and do not show the *manner* in which the thing was done; while you say not a word either about taxes or paper-money.

This being the cause, as clearly as is nose upon face, what remedy have *you* prepared for it? And how do the people deserve the charge of *idleness* and *improvidence*? What *remedy* have *you* for an evil proceeding from *such a cause*? The remedy, and only remedy, must, in the mind of any man of sense, have been to cause the deduction from wages to *cease*, seeing that that deduction was the immediate cause of the evil to be remedied. And, then, the question was, how this was to be *effected*? Whereupon would arise the question, what is the cause of the diminution of wages? The answer to which would have been, the *paper-money*. Remove, then, the paper-money. Cut off the spring-head of the mischief, and the mischief will cease.

Oh, no! Not a word about his! But a long string of censures on the poor! Their *idleness*,

their *vices*, their *improvidence*, their *profligacy*. Not a word about the master mischief. That was as hidden as the deeds of murderers. All was plain and clear as daylight if the true cause had been frankly stated; but this cause you had never thought of, though you had "*devoted years*" to the subject! Bless your head! That this cause, so efficient, so complete, so plain to be seen; that this *only possible* cause should never, during all those years of application to the subject, once creep under your wig!

That it did not is, I think, clear enough, from what I am now going to notice. It is very curious, that I, in reading your speech against the poor Rumpite, EVANS, at Manchester, "*fustened*," as Mr. BROUGHAM called it, upon several passages, and was beginning, as you probably may recollect, to serve them out in weekly doses, when this bill drew me off, leaving several of the passages unnoticed, one of which comes in here very pat to my purpose, in the following words: "During seasons of public distress and calamity, arising in no degree from the acts or measures of government, but from causes which no government could controul, such as a

“*division of capital into new channels of trade, from which alone, a considerable share of temporary distress would always result, it too often happened that those who were not the best judges, though they were the most numerous and severe sufferers, adopted opinions which led to consequences most dangerous.*”

Now, I call the gentlemen “*in doors*” to witness, whether the former part of this sentence is not, almost word for word, what Castlereagh said in 1816. “The division of capital into new branches of trade!” What division? What new branches? What preciously unmeaning jargon! He was told at the same time by me, that the *division* would be *very long about*; and that, as to the new branches of trade, he might hunt for them in some other country; for that he would not find them here. He was told it then; and Mr. WESTERN was told to take his eyes from the clover-seed-sack, and to fix them on the bank-note mill.

But, the *apology for the government* was *neat*! It showed a good deal; though it could

make no sensible man adopt the doctrine. There are no causes of public distress, for which the government is not completely answerable. “No controul!” Controul enough as to our purses and persons, but *no controul* as to causes of our distress! Why, here is the *cause of it all*. And did not the government create it? Did it not pour out the paper-money, make the loans, and lay on the taxes? Cannot I open the statute book, and put my finger upon all the loan-acts, exchequer bill acts, subsidy acts, bank-charter and restriction acts; cannot I show the tax acts? Is not the *cause* there? Did not the government create the cause? And will you, then, say, that the government has had *no controul* in the affair?

As to your *motives* for making this apology for the government, I shall leave others to express their opinions upon them; but the “*division of capital into new branches of trade*” show clearly the size of your mind as to such matters. It is just the sort of parrot-like talk, that one would expect to hear from the leading politician of some little country town, who has caught

hold of a minister's words, and who mouths them out in pompous accent to the haberdashers that smoke their pipes with him.

A division of capital! New branches of trade! Why, the very idea of such causes, when there was a paper-money at work, was little short of proof of absolute imbecility. Poor Mr.

JUDGE BAILEY one could excuse. He had been *reading law* all his life time. He knew nothing of England but what he had seen in the streets and the courts. That *he* should think a

National Debt a *blessing* was not so very surprizing. I think, however, that *he* said, he had

long thought upon the matter!

But, one might excuse him. He saw strange confusions arising.

He saw that the people had got upon the scent of the Debt; and he thought that his opinions

might tend to quiet them. He had, I will engage, never really

thought upon the subject. He had read and heard the shallow

thoughts of others; and had, at

last, come to something which he, I dare say, regarded as truth.

But *you*, a *legislator*, the proposer of a law to change the very basis of civil society in England; *you*, who had *devoted years* to subjects of political economy, to bring out, as a gravely delivered opinion, what had been laughed at from 1816 to 1821, was a little too much to be expected by any one who had not taken your dimensions with as much accuracy as I had done.

However, when one looks at this speech, made to the Lancashire shirers, one cannot be much surprised at *the bill*. It is evident, that you never before saw the cause of the ruin and degradation of the labourers. You never read Two-penny Trash; not you, indeed! If you had, *you never would have brought in this bill*. You read the Trash now, I'll warrant; and, you will bear it in mind when your genius pricks you on to bring forward another measure, involving such tremendous consequences.

Another proof of possessing no overstock of understanding, as to such matters, is the bringing of *any* new law forward about the poor just *at this time!* There is now a *revolution*, a real revolution *actually taking place*. Property is changing hands, and the profits of labour are changing hands. Things are in as much uncertainty as if an enemy had landed and taken possession of one half of the country. Dying fathers scarcely know how to make their wills. People are afraid to borrow and afraid to lend. Nothing but the gold in hand is regarded as secure. Marriages are actually put off, in order to see what is going to happen. And, as to contracts between landlords and renters, they are become nothing at all. Every thing portends some great and terrible change in the whole of the affairs of the kingdom. And, was this, of all others, the moment for making a law such as you would have had to pass?

It must be clear to every man of common sense (and the Ministers seem to perceive it), that, in the crisis which is approaching, it will be desirable to have the millions without cause to complain of hunger and nakedness. If they be well off, there is little to fear. But, if they consist of inflammable matter, who can think of the dangers without horror? And, what that ever entered into the mind of man could be so well calculated to inflame them as your bill passed into a law? The *right* of relief in case of need is so deeply rooted in the minds of the labourers of this once happy country; their *right* to go to the land in case of need makes a part of their very minds, which is cherished, too, by all the laws of settlements, vagrancy, and by all that is dinned into the ears of every beggar or poor complainant. To remove this impression you must sweep away the whole race. And, with this settled way of thinking in existence, to promulgate a pe-

nalty, or, at least, a refusal of relief, on account of *marriage!* To make *two sorts* of poor, one entitled to relief and the other not! To rouse the feelings and set the tongues going of all the *women!* To do this, and at such a time too, and without any necessity, really does appear fully to justify Mr. GURNEY in calling it "a flagrant act of insanity."

And yet, what is to become of this deplorable bill! Talk of "*improvident parents,*" indeed! There may be young fellows and girls that "*rush into marriage,*" but was ever thoughtlessness more complete than has been evinced by the parent of this hapless bill? Mr. Brougham says, that it is neither *honest* nor *politic* to beget a child without having provided *support* for it before hand. We will leave the *honesty* out of the question, but, surely, we may say it is as little *politic* thoughtlessly to beget poor-law improvement and education-digest bills. Worst come

to worst, the married labourers *save* their children; but, never was bastard in hay-loft born, with a horse pond at hand, in greater peril than the legislative offspring of you, the two most aspiring geniuses of the age!

God forbid I should insinuate that you are deficient in parental feeling! Never did the fondest of the feline race more gallantly guard its young; and what is to take place if "any thing should happen" to it, I am wholly at a loss to conjecture. That we shall hang our pages with black, as the Liverpool papers lately did theirs on account of the death of the Pitt-Club, there can be little doubt; nor will the soul of friendship withhold monodies and epitaphs abundant; but, who shall pour the balm of comfort into the lacerated bosom of the afflicted parent! To ask a favour of you at such a season; to bespeak before hand the salt testimonials of your sorrow, may seem unfeeling; but, it is well known, that the tears of Mary Magdalen

were preserved for centuries and used as a protection against thunder and lightning; and, as the "kindly drops," which the newspapers say you seemed to shed, upon a recent doleful occasion, had such wonderful effect in favour of "*England's Glory*," let me beg for one small phial, to be for me a charm against the dire effects of indictments and informations *ex-officio*; so shall I be secure from dungeons and from all the demons of the law, and you shall be consoled for the loss of your bill by the reflection, that your name will go down to posterity enrolled in the Register's Calendar of Saints.

WM. COBBETT.

The Humble Petition of the several persons whose names are hereto subscribed, being Inhabitants of the town of Holt in the county of Norfolk or the neighbourhood thereof; Sheweth,

That your Petitioners contemplate with sorrow the practical effect of that clause of the Poor Laws Amendment

Bill, now before your Honourable House, the object of which is to prevent the payment of any sums out of the Poor Rates to save those able bodied men from starving, who from the distress of the Agricultural Interest, or other causes, may make application for Parish relief.

That your Petitioners, can from their own experience, contradict the statement made in support of that clause, that "such sums are given to cherish the vices and the indolence of that class of the Poor who are disposed to exert rather on the charity of others than to depend for their own bread on their own exertion"—the practice of the neighbourhood, and of every other within their knowledge, being, to give no parish allowance to persons who are capable of working, without compelling them to labour as the means of obtaining a maintenance.

That the operation of the clause in question, if it pass into a law, will be to compel the charitable and humane to establish a fund for the relief of the unemployed and able poor, by which means the reduction of parish allowances will save nothing to the public, while it will diminish the income of the generous to increase that of the sordid man.

That if such a contribution be not made, the effect on the Poor will be, to enforce a division of the scanty profits of labour, or of the parish pittance to the old, the infirm, and the helpless (through compassion or the powerful ties of kindred), to assist those whom the rich will have destined to starvation:—that this division will deepen the misery of the poor of all ages, and will increase their dissatisfaction at the measures of those who possess property, whom they will look upon as combined against their lives as well as their comforts:—that the allowances they have been accustomed to received from time immemorial they will consider as their undoubted right, and the seizure of them as a violation of their property:—that the young and active will attempt to get by stratagem and force what will appear to them to be withheld by a partial law, and that the Poor collectively will justify them on the plea of necessity, and be led to aid and assist them in their attacks upon property:—that if such a state of things be suffered to continue, an organized system of depredation will spread throughout the country; against which no tangible property will be safe, and for the punishment of which the rich will be afraid to seek, and no evidences

amongst the poor will be found:—that the loss of property will, therefore, be more than equivalent to the charge of the poor rates—and that, that moral turpitude, which now infects only a small part, will pervade the whole body of the labouring classes, and be sanctified by the appellation of a struggle against oppression.

That, under the present system, the parish offices for managing the Poor are found to be filled with most advantage to the country by men of sound understanding and compassionate disposition, who under the cruel law which is now before your Honourable House, will be unable to bear the accumulated misery which will continually present itself to their view, being deprived of the ability to alleviate it; and that those offices will therefore be exclusively filled by men of the hardest hearts, whose power being exercised without feeling, will only widen the breach between the suffering and irritated poor and their richer townsman, and hasten the period at which the law in question will effect the total demoralization of the lower orders.

And your Petitioners, with great humility, suggest, that the present melancholy state of the working classes is mainly attributable to the inhuman

amount of capital which is withdrawn from the employment of labour by the public funds, and for the support of Government, and by the low value of the present wages of labour compared with the wages of former times, occasioned principally by the heavy taxation upon the necessities of life, by which also they believe the amount of the poor rates to be nearly doubled.

Your Petitioners, therefore, pray that your Honourable House will reject with indignation every attempt to lessen the few privileges which are now left to the poor; that it will diligently enquire into the real causes which have reduced the working classes to their present degraded and miserable condition; and that it will finally adopt such measures as will at no distant period afford employment or sufficient wages to all who are able to labour, by which alone, they can regain their independence of character, and cease to be burthensome to the community.

bo

1901

TO THE FUND-LORDS.

My LORDS,

The contest, or, rather, the fight, between you and the Landlords is approaching. You are,

I see, mustering your forces. A Clerk in the *Mint* has published some *tables of figures*, the object of which is to show, *that you have not been gainers by the rise in the value of the current money.* This gentleman is quite deceived. He fixes his eye upon the wrong places. His book will, however, with the aid of the tooting press, tend to make the *strife obstinate.* I see you have got the *Times* and the *Chronicle* with you! Alas, for the lords of the soil!

This is precisely what I wish to see. I wish the conflict to be *long and desperate*: not a mere skirmish and an end. And, before it is over, the government will grow *so tame* and will look *so foolish*, and the labourers will be so fat and merry and saucy and good-humoured, that it will be quite delightful to live in England. Oh blessed Bill of Peel!

My lords, I am by no means your enemy. I am not at all anxious that the Landlords should beat you. From you the millions have received, directly

at least, neither injury nor insult. You are a fungus, to be sure, and so are many of your foes. Therefore, as far as feeling is concerned, I am perfectly impartial; and care not a straw which goes to the wall.

There was an idea prevailing, for a long while, that you would both go on hand in hand to the end of time: that, like Saul and Jonathan, your lives would be sweet and pleasant, and that, in your deaths, you would not be divided. "My dear," says some lover, "we will walk together to the end of this world, and locked in each others arms, leap into the next." The history goes on to say that they ended in having a cat and dog fight.

Thus will it be with you and the landlords. While the work of deducting from the wages of labour was going on; while the Labouring Classes were really paying all the taxes, you agreed exceedingly well. *Public Credit* and *Agricultural Improvement* were indivisible friends. Both

joined cordially in "support of government," and in extolling the *Constitution*, and in pledging the last shilling and the last drop of blood. But now, when poverty comes in at the door, love seems to be flying out of the window.

This is what I, for my part, always anticipated. I always looked forward to it as the sure cause of our deliverance; having seen Europe "delivered," I was anxious to see *England* delivered a little; and I was sure, that this fight would deliver it. In my leave-taking address, upon going to America, I said, that there was no hope for the people till the landlords and you should separate. The time of separation is come; and the people begin to cheer up.

There are those who hope for a compromise between you. The thing is impossible. No man voluntarily yields up his estate, or his money, for the sole benefit of another man. The thing cannot be. The law must settle the

matter, and it is in the passing, or endeavouring to pass, this law that the parties will come to open war. I must confess, that I am puzzled to know on which side I ought to be, in this fight. I think I shall stand by, and back both parties on, as boys do dogs. I long to see you fast in each other's hair! I care not how you carry on the fight; fair-play, or foul play, just as you please. I am sure, for my part, to have both pleasure and profit from the fight; and the *longer* the fight lasts, the better it will be for the nation at large, and for the cause of freedom all over the world. If I were the Minister, the fight should not last above *three weeks*; just while I could get a bill through the houses; but, then, I should do a *great many things*, at the same time, which I cannot suppose it possible that these Ministers will ever even *think of*, much less *do*. A good long fight will lay the thing *so bare*! Will strip off all the disguise *so completely*! Will make even children see the

folly and wickedness of the Pitt-system! And, as to myself, will give me happiness not to be described.

There can, I am happy to be assured, be no *compromise*; and I think you stand a good chance of complete victory, and of seeing all safely lodged in the poor-house, or serving you in the capacity of shoe-blacks or footmen. You will certainly have the tooting press with you; and that will make a *hideous noise* against your foes, who are cowards, mind, except when they have to ride in upon the defenceless. Against women and children they are as brave as bull dogs, and as furious as tygers; but, when *tackled*, they hang down their tails like sheep-biters. Go on, my lords! Press upon them, and avenge those whom they have oppressed and persecuted. The noisy press is with you; and that alone will keep your foes in awe. No one will like to be foremost in attacking you. The tooting press is, itself, a fundlord and stock-jobber.

and the *country* part of it is little better than a *branch* of the grand tooter in London. If this tooter, who is naturally of *you*, who has sprung from the same root, and whose fate, as a *trader*, is closely linked to 'yours; if this tooter, this clamorous, this stunning tooter, take a decided part with you, you will bring Sir Pompous Jolterhead and his whole race upon their knees before you.

You have many things on your side. The *name* of *Debt* is a great thing. The very words: *public debt; public creditor; creditor of the nation; loan; lend; lent; borrow and borrowed*. All these words, though not at all applicable to things, have great power on your side. To propose to reduce the interest will by the tooting press, be called a design to commit *fraud*; and then all the fools, led by the greatest rogues in Christendom and Judea united, will set up a cry enough to frighten poor Jolterhead out of his senses;

Then you will necessarily have

with you all the people that receive public money in any shape. All the placemen, pensioners, sinecurists, grantees, civil list people, army, navy, taxes of all sorts and sizes; for, they will perceive, that, *before* a farthing of interest can be deducted from *you*, all their sinecures must be *reduced*! This is, in my opinion, your great security. This appears to me to be the rock of your safety. Let me advise you to put this constantly before the eyes of the public. Let them never lose sight of it. Talk of the "widows and orphans too." That will do something; but, it is the salaries and pensions and grants and sinecures and pay and retired allowances; it is this battery that you will play off upon the foe with most effect.

I dare say, that some little thoughts hostile to you have been afloat in the minds of GAFFER GOOCH's Committee. But, nothing will come of them. Nay, I now think, as I always thought, that that famous Committee will

never make any report at all. We shall, I dare say, see it go off, by-and-by, *till the next session*, like Lawyer Scarlett's Bill and Lawyer Onslow's Bill, and Lawyer Brougham's Bill. The discovery has, at last, been made, that *the Debt* is the cause of all the *distress*. Consequently there is no remedy other than that of *getting rid of the Debt*; and this is a matter that the arms of Yeomanry Cavalry cannot effect. This "monster of consumption" is not to be brought down even by Manchester Magistrates. *Sidmouth's Circular* and the *Six Acts* will do nothing here. It is an affair of *Debtor and Creditor*; and, if you be wise, the law will take its course. Keep the tooting press with you; keep the *salaries* constantly before the public; and leave the rest to Providence.

You must have high enjoyment to see the lords of the soil hampered and bothered as they are at this time. It is with no eye of satisfaction that they can

look at their domains, every clod and stick and leaf of which are mortgaged to you for more than twice their worth, if now brought to the hammer. But, as you truly say, a man, that *borrow*s on his land, knows that he is to pay with his land. You lent to them in their "hour of emergency." Stand to that, and make the tooting press swear it six times a week every week in the year. Don't say any thing about the *mode* of lending, or about the unaccountable means by which you became *possessed* of twice as much money as the whole of the land and houses and mines, and woods and canals, and rivers would sell for. Don't say a word about these: say, you *had* the money; that it was the fruit of your own *honest industry*; that you lent for "the *defence of the land* in an hour *of emergency*." Stand to that; don't answer any questions that may lead to *explanations*: keep the tooting press on your side, and talk eternally about the sala-

ries; and you will soon be in possession of all the Abbeyes and Priories, and Advowsons and Parks, and Dog-kennels and Game-Preserves in the kingdom; of all, at any rate, except those which belong to persons who draw out of the taxes as well as yourselves.

The Agriculturallasses will make a shocking noise. They will begin as soon as they find, that GAFFER GOOCH can do nothing for them. Hitherto they have been *waiting*, first to see whether “things would not *come about* ;” and next to see, whether “*the House*” would not “*do something for them*.” They will now be quite *desperate*; and, it being quite useless for them to *bluster*, they will fling up the farms at a great rate. Those that have leases will not fulfil the conditions of them; if run upon, they will sell off privately, and more out of the country; and the landlords may as well go with them, at once; but, they will hang on; they will haunt

about the mansions that once were theirs, and which would have been theirs now, if they had, in time, followed my advice.

I really expect to see thousands of them coming to the parish book. They will then be able to judge of the sufficiency of *a gallon loaf and three pence a week*. At any rate, if Peel's Bill go into effect, either *you* or *they* must come to the parish book at last. Nor is the process *long*. No man can live without an *income*. Rents are their income; and no rents will they get long before May 1823.

There are two opinions in the unconcerned part of the public as to which of the two it would be desirable to see fall, seeing that one *must fall*. Some lament the prospect that the extinction of so much Norman blood presents; while others think, that the turn of the Jews is come, and go so far as to say, that *this* is their promised kingdom, and that *here* they are to be gathered together in their restored state; and that,

as to *ancient family*, what pretensions have the Normans compared with the descendants of Abraham? One thing will happen, if the Jews should prevail, and that is, an end to all disputes about *pedigree*, and to all the plague which people have in tracing their blood back to the "*Conquest*" and the "*Conquest or.*" The Earl of *Portarlington*, for instance, whose name is vulgarly called *Dawson*, is, his peerage tells us, descended from the Normans, and that his real name is *D'Ossoune*. I can take care, indeed (as I will) that the tune of "*Nancy Dawson*," shall, when played to me, be called "*Nancy D'Ossoune*;" but, will others do this? They will continue to call the noble Earl's name *Dawson*; that is to say the *son of Daw*; and *Daw* is pure English, the name of a well known bird that usually has the Christian name of *Jack* put before it, while the name of the same bird, in the Norman language, is *Choucas*. The introduction of

the Jews would put an end to all those vulgarisms. There would be no disputes about descent: all would be the seed of *Abraham*; and their high blood we should all be ready to acknowledge, seeing that the very book of our faith informs us, that they justly count innumerable *kings* and *queens* amongst their illustrious progenitors. A plague of your high-blooded French, say I! Give me the Noble descendants of Moses and Aaron!

As to which would be *best for the people*, that, I think, is soon settled; for, the question is, not what the Jews would do if they *could*, but whether the Jews *could* give the people less a week than a *gallon loaf and three pence*. That is the only question, and as that must be answered in the negative, I really do not see that the people have any thing to apprehend from the expected transfer. The Jews would, too, bear in mind, I hope, what God himself so often reminded their forefathers of, and which, if they

forgot it, we could bring, by a jog, to their memories; namely, that their ancestors were once *bondsmen* in the land of Egypt, and that they complained most bitterly, though, according to their own voluntary confession, Pharoah was no churl, but kept their *flesh-pots* well furnished. We hear of no *gallon-loaf* and *three pence a week* under Pharoah; and yet the Jews could not be contented. He had, indeed, a sort of *check-population project*; but, as that appears to have brought things to a *crisis*, and to have produced, in the end, an appeal, on the part of the Jews, to the *law of nature*, the descendants of those Jews would hardly attempt the same amongst us.

Upon the whole, therefore the prospect is not only consoling but cheering. The difference in religion would be an advantage rather than otherwise; for, in the first place, we could certainly demand a participation in the produce of the earth according with the rules and prin-

ciples laid down by Moses. Our keeping the Sunday and our new Lords the Saturday would be another advantage; for it would preclude those distinctions in places of worship, which draw off the mind from things above, and not unfrequently cause envy and hatred to thrust piety out of the heart. *Pork* and *bacon*, our great delight, our lords would loath; and *hares*, which our present lords regard as sacred from vulgar touch, our Jewish seigneurs hold in utter abomination. Thus we should get at a participation in the *game*, the laws relating to which, would, of course, undergo a material alteration.

However, my lords, let me deal frankly with you. All that the *Clerk of the Mint* has said is *fallacious*; it is *radically and grossly erroneous*; and this I *must* show, because *I must speak the truth*. You stand upon no foundation whatever. Commonsense scouts your elaim. But, you will make long and stout fight, which is sure to do good, and you *may*

triumph, and that can do no harm. It is the *length and fury* of the fight that I want to see.

Keep the long-eared tooting press with you, and I shall do you no injury; and, besides, I am with you as to *salaries*. The *TIMES* newspaper is your mark. It is the literary *paradise of fools*, a most numerous tribe! If you can once get this noisy bawler to *set up a cry*, your business is more than half done. And, mind, *this* is your way. Your Clerk of the Mint, Mr. MUSCHETT, is easily upset, as I shall show the public in my next. No, no: there is nothing in the way of fact, or of argument that can serve you. It must be sheer *outcry*, and that pretty loud too. It must place the noisy fools on your side; and when that is done, you may set sense and reason at defiance. Go on, my lords, and make stout fight; and as far as that goes I am your friend,

WM. COBBETT.

TO

GAFFER GOOCH.

DEAR GAFFER,

With the greatest anxiety I have, from week to week, been waiting for the Report of your Committee. And, here is Midsummer almost come, and no report has made its appearance! Surely, it cannot have been kept back merely because I was *watching for it*? It was, and it is, my resolution to *republish it with notes*, in case of its coming forth.

And, therefore, this non-appearance of it is a sore disappointment to me. But, is it not also a disappointment to the "agriculturists," those meritorious persons, who, you said, paid so largely to the *property tax*? What are they now to do, if no decision is made upon their case? Are they to wait till the *next session*? Not they indeed. The non-appearance of the Report will convince them, that nothing can be done for them, or will be done for them; and they will be

more ready to listen to *me* than they have been; to me, who have always told them, that the debt was their night-mare; and that, unless they could remove *that*, there was no remedy.

It is called *ill-natured to rejoice* in the confusion of this set of men; but I can see no justice in this charge. Were not whole classes of men persecuted and proscribed under the names of *Jacobins* and *Radicals*? And was not this now pretended suffering class amongst the bitterest of the persecutors? Besides, it is the distress of the stupid oafs that is the subject of any one's rejoicing. We rejoice at *the good to others*, of which their distress is a symptom and concomitant. The case is this: *they must come down before a better state of things can come*; and, therefore, we rejoice at seeing them coming down. But, it is right, too, in a moral point of view, that they should suffer; that each of them, in his neighbourhood, and under the eyes of those who have seen his insolence and

arrogance, should also see his humiliation. Humiliation does not *kill* people. They will get on very well in smock frocks; and, if they cannot bring themselves to that, they must retire, or quit the country; and a good riddance it will be.

These men, and their landlords too, have long entertained the vain hope, that the corn would *get up* again. Now, is it not obstinacy deserving of *punishment* to entertain this hope in the face of all that I have written upon the subject? "*You written!*" Oh! Very well, then, shall *I not rejoice* at your distress? If I told you, that you were supporting a system, which enslaved the people, and would finally ruin yourselves; and, if you despised my warning, am I not to be *glad* to see you punished? Every man who has suffered from a system supported by you is fully justified in rejoicing at your distress, and *I in particular*.

However, to the owners of land (except they occupy themselves

and live within their means) and even to the large occupiers who are renters, and who are not very rich, the distress is, as yet, only in the *embryo*. The thing is hardly fairly begun. The loans were made in wheat at *twelve* shillings a bushel, and can the interest on them be paid in wheat at *four* shillings a bushel? Yet, this is *the system* which the Yeomanry Cavalry have *supported*! That it will come to four shillings a bushel I have no doubt. Does not every thing promise this? Is it not criminal, then, in these men to affect attachment to such a system?

The *petitions* have said nothing about *taxes*; nothing about *the Debt*; and, what is more, they make a *merit* of *their* silence on these heads. It is clear, therefore, that *they* still cling to the *system*, under which the millions have suffered; and shall we not rejoice, then, at *their* sufferings? Mr. CANNING is come back! The poet of "*the Pilot that weathered the storm.*" We shall

see what *he* will do! He has, doubtless, brought home, from the Bourbon School, some *remedy* for your ills! Oh, no! And he will *now* find, that *flashy* speeches are of no avail. He will now see, if he read as he ought to do, what sort of a thing he has to deal with. I bear in mind what he said about the time of Peel's Bill. He said it was a subject that he *did not pretend to understand*. I told him then, that he would find it the very thing of all others, that he should, as quickly as possible, endeavour to understand. This he has already found to be true; and, if he come into the Ministry (as it is said he will with Mr. Huskisson) I shall not be at all surprised to see him break forth with a new-light that will dissipate all the darkness of the last forty years. He is resolved to have *old Sarrum* still; but he will soon see, that we must have, then, *all the old things*! We must have the *old money*, above all things; for, if we have that, we shall have all the rest. I know very

well his way of thinking: I know, that he abhors all the newfangled projects of schools, penitentiaries, Tract-societies, and all the canting combinations of the day. In this I perfectly agree with him, though for a different reason. But, these are *fungusses*, all growing up naturally and necessarily out of the present, or, I hope I may call it, *late*, system: out of that very Pitt-system, which has now been abandoned; or, which, at least, has been suspended.

In conclusion, let me beg of you to do something to let us know what you *intend*; for it is of great consequence, that we be informed of that, and with all convenient speed. You can do *nothing*; but, pray, say so, then. *Uncertainty* is the farmer's worst foe. However, he will begin to be convinced, that you can do nothing; and that may have the same effect as a positive declaration on your part. The mere suspense must, nevertheless, have been very injurious. This project of "relief for agricultural

"*distress*" has been on foot, while an industrious man would have got a wife and a couple of children. It is time it ended in one way or other; and an end of it I hope we shall speedily see.

WM. COBBETT.

"ENGLAND'S GLORY."

There has taken place a very *serious* affair between this hero and Mr. Canning, which I shall notice more fully in my next. The old hyperbole, "in the *lowest deep a lower deep*," has now almost been made literally true. Good God! That England's glory should have come to this at last! And that *his* friend should complain of *causing letters to be published*! And that, too, in a case, where publication was obviously just and proper, and involved *no breach of confidence*. However, I have not room to go, at present, fully into this subject, which is of much

greater public importance than any former transaction of the kind ever was. It involves principles of great magnitude ; and, therefore, is worthy of public attention. Nothing was ever, surely, so *cutting* as Mr. CAN-
 NING's answer to the letter of " England's Glory." I shall insert the documents ; for they really are matter of deep public interest.

GOLD PAYMENTS.

They keep on steadily, and great quantities of *sovereigns get out*. People *like* them ; and well they may, when such multitudes of forged notes are in circulation ! Attempts are, however, making, in the Morning Chronicle and other papers, to put a stop to this only remedy for the miseries of England. These I shall notice in my next ; and, in the meanwhile, it may be right for me to say, that, from all I *see* and all I *hear*, the Ministers are resolved to *push on*. I have this from *authority* which I cannot particularly describe ; and, I firmly believe it, because it perfectly corresponds with what I, in their place, should deem my own *interest* and *safety*. Supposing myself in their place, and foreseeing, as I do, a time of great peril, I would, at any rate, have the *millions quiet* ; and this their present measures will not fail to effect. They *must see*, now, that the whole of the paper-system

will go to pieces. They must know that shocks will arise ; and, they must desire to be safe in the midst of those shocks. Leaving *duty* out of the question, it is their *interest* to push on with the *Gold*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

I have received the letter of CANDIDUS about LORD STOURTON's pamphlets. They are not worthy of notice. They contain *dreams* ; and his Lordship is, I dare say, awake by *this time*.

NOTICE TO VENDERS.

The Venders of the Register, in the country, are informed, that it is always ready for delivery to persons who send parcels to the country, by *twelve o'clock on the Friday*. This arrangement has taken place in order that the Register may be published every where within a hundred miles of London on the *Saturday*. If venders, in any part of the coun-

try, find any difficulty in getting their parcels sent off on the Friday, their best way is to apply *directly to the Office, No. 1, Clement's Inn.*—The *Stamped Register*, is published on the Saturday, and, of course, goes by *post*. This may best be obtained by gentlemen applying to their *news-men* or at the Office.

COBBETT'S SERMONS.

Sermons the public call them, and I will do the same. The *Six Acts* provides for the free circulation of pamphlets on religion, so that I may be said to take, in this case, the benefit of those acts. I will confess, that it was those Acts which *inspired* me with the thought of preaching in print. "*Tract*" is beneath the thing described; and, besides, the public *will have* mine to be *Sermons*. Sermons, therefore, they shall be. As a proof of the piety of the days, in which we live, and of

my superiority over the *Doctors*, I will venture to say, that I am able to prove a ten times greater sale of my *Sermons*, than can be proved of the *Sermons* of any Doctor that belongs, or ever did belong, to either of the Universities.

PRELIMINARY PART

OF

COBBETT'S PAPER AGAINST GOLD.

This Work is just published, price 3s. 6d. and it does, I think, clearly prove the *justice* as well as the *necessity* of greatly reducing first, and, in the end, stopping altogether, the *Interest of the Debt*. It consists of Essays written between 1803 and 1806, both inclusive, to which are subjoined, some notes. Its arguments then were met by arguments (which are all fairly stated) and by most foul abuse. They remained wholly unshaken then; and, I am

satisfied, they will remain unshaken now.—The reader will be amused to see, that Mr. RICARDO's project for *dividing the land with the fund-holders, originated with one of the silliest of my antagonists of 1806!* Oh! Mr Perry! How "happy the Spanish Legislator must be to be

"able to take down from his shelf a Blackstone, or a Ricardo!"

SCOTCH MENE STOCK.

A small Quantity of this much esteemed property to be sold.—Any Brother Stockholder wishing to increase the amount of his Stock may apply by Letter only (post-paid) to X. Y. No. 2, Southcot Place, Widcomb, Bath.

The best bidder at per cent. will have the preference.